

REMARKS

The present claims relate to a tire.

Status of the claims

Claims 6-9 are pending, and all claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over JP 10-053010 in view of Yoshikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,872,932) for reasons of record.

Response to claim rejection

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons of record.

The second Supplemental Declaration submitted with the Amendment filed October 10, 2006 demonstrates the unexpectedly superior results of the present invention, and thus further supports the patentability of the present invention.

The Examiner stated that the scan of the photographs submitted with the Supplemental Declaration were poor, and that therefore the Supplemental Declaration was insufficient to overcome the rejection. In response, Applicants had previously attached electronic copies of the photographs, which the Examiner again indicated were unclear, presumably because of the scanning procedures in place at the USPTO. Therefore, Applicants attach to this Response an

enlarged grayscale copy of the figures present in the Supplemental Declaration, which should be clear.

If the Examiner wishes for the color photos to be made an “artifact” to the case, then Applicants respectfully request the Examiner disclose to Applicants how to do so.

In view of the clear photographs, Applicants maintain their previously stated position with respect to the Declaration, which is repeated here for ease of the Examiner’s reference.

In the Supplemental Declaration, tires A and B were prepared in the same manner as described in Example 1 and Comparative Example and subjected to the same drum durability test, as described in the Examples in the present specification. Then, each of the tested tires A and B was peeled to evaluate adhesiveness between rubber and non-woven fabric.

As seen from the attached photos I-V, the contact area of the non-woven fabric with rubber in the tire B of Comparative Example is smaller than that in the tire A of Example 1. As a result, the tire B shows the disheveled non-woven fabric (see photo VI). That is, the adhesiveness in the tire A of Example 1 according to the present invention is superior to that in the tire B of Comparative Example. Mr. Yoshikawa concludes that the present invention provides unexpectedly superior results.


Mr. Yoshikawa further states that even if the non-woven fabric in Comparative Example is treated with a conventional dip treatment, the adhesiveness cannot be enhanced because the non-woven fabric clogs to form a film, thereby reducing its contact area with the rubber to which the non-woven fabric is adhered.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are not obvious over the cited references, and thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Sunhee Lee
Registration No. 53,892

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 24, 2007

I

A
(Example 1)



B
(Comparative
Example)



II

A
(Example 1)




B
(Comparative
Example)




III

A
(Example 1)




B
(Comparative
Example)




IV

A
(Example 1)



B
(Comparative
Example)



V

A
(Example 1)




B
(Comparative
Example)



VI

A
(Example 1)



B
(Comparative
Example)

